

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * * * *

CHRISTOPHER A. JONES,)	3:10-cv-00162-LRH-VPC
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	ORDER
HOWARD SKOLNIK, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
Defendants.)	

Before the Court is Plaintiff Christopher A. Jones' ("Jones") Objection to the Magistrate Judge's Order (Doc. #257¹) pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A), Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(a), and Local Rule IB 3-1(a). Doc. #265. Defendant Jeremiah Schultz ("Schultz") filed a Response, to which Jones did not reply. Doc. #272. A magistrate judge's orders operate as final determinations of pretrial matters under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A) and Local Rule IB 1-3. Accordingly, a district judge may reconsider a magistrate judge's order only if it is "clearly erroneous or contrary to law." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a); LR IB 3-1(a).

The Court has reviewed the relevant documents and pleadings on file in this matter and finds that the Magistrate Judge's Order, to which Jones objects, is not clearly erroneous or contrary to law. Therein, the Magistrate Judge declined to require Schultz to supplement his answer to Jones' Request for Interrogatory No. 24. *See* Doc. #257, p. 3. Jones' Interrogatory No. 24 requests "[t]he name (full name) of the inmate that may have suffered a broken wrist as a direct or indirect result of your actions." Schultz objected on the basis that "[t]his interrogatory

¹ Refers to the Court's docket entry number.

1 seeks irrelevant information and will not likely lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.
2 Additionally, this interrogatory seeks information on another inmate, which is in violation of
3 Administrative Regulation 569.”

4 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(b)(1) permits parties to obtain discovery on any
5 matter related to the party’s claims or defenses that “appears reasonably calculated to lead to the
6 discovery of admissible evidence.” As Jones’ only remaining claim is for retaliation, his
7 Interrogatory No. 24 does not appear to be reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of
8 admissible evidence. Additionally, even if the Court were to determine that the requested
9 information is relevant, Nevada Department of Corrections Administrative Regulation 569
10 prohibits disclosure of confidential inmate information. Because the Magistrate Judge’s ruling in
11 this regard was not clearly erroneous or contrary to law, Jones’ Objection is overruled.

12
13 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Jones’ Objection (Doc. #265) is OVERRULED.

14
15 IT IS SO ORDERED.

16 DATED this 4th day of June, 2014.

17
18 
19 LARRY R. HICKS
20 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28